



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to the Mukwara Kilpara model, and to that which is now decadent among the Tlingit. Are the resemblances purely fortuitous?

My method may be terribly illogical and unscientific, but, even so, it has enabled me to find out facts that had been unknown or ignored. My hypothesis required that Australian phratries should have totemic names. I proved that one-third of the known Australian phratry names,—the third which can be translated,—have totemic names, with one rather doubtful exception, the “light blood” and “dark blood” of the Euahlayi.

My hypothesis required that each Australian phratry should have in it a totem-kin of the animal of the phratry name. I proved that in many instances where our information was full and native names of the totem animals were given, the case was as, according to my hypothesis, it ought to be. It is not wholly a bad method which leads to discoveries. May the method of Mr Goldenweiser be equally fortunate!

I hope presently to send to Mr Goldenweiser my hypothesis of the origin of all these things, including phratries. But he will see with horror that I “seize on prominent features in the totemisms” of three most primitive Australian “nations,” to project them into the past of all totemists with the system of two intermarrying exogamous phratries of animal names. “How bad, and mad, and sad this is,” but “it fills the bill.” The hypothesis works—that is, things may have occurred as I suppose; if they did the results must have been the state of affairs with which we are familiar.

ANDREW LANG

ALLEYNE HOUSE
ST ANDREWS
FIFE, SCOTLAND

ANDREW LANG ON METHOD IN THE STUDY OF TOTEMISM

MR LANG's broadside attack is always formidable. Having survived its impact, I propose to consider some of his criticisms. Mr Lang's bracketed comments on my Table¹ reveal a terminological misunderstanding. By “Central Australia” I did not mean “Arunta”; following the precedent of Spencer and Gillen, I used the term to cover all the tribes from the Aranda and Loritja in the south to the Anula and Mara on the Gulf of Carpentaria. Not all of the statements in the Central Australia column of my Table are true of all of the above tribes, any more than all of the statements about British Columbia

¹ Totemism, an Analytical Study, *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, 1910, p. 229.

apply to all of the Northwest Coast tribes. In justice to Mr Lang, I may add that I feel in part responsible for the misunderstanding, which could have been avoided had I specified the tribes to which each statement applied, as I have done in the British Columbia column.¹

Mr Lang makes certain positive assertions about the nature of the totemic complex and the origin of totemism. Before we turn to these, a brief restatement of the main positions of the second part of my *Totemism* may prove useful. Having, in Part I, dealt with two totemic complexes, I then take up some of the individual features, such as exogamy, taboo, etc., and analyze them from an historical and psychological point of view. The provisional conclusion expressed in the summary of Part I is thus confirmed; the features prove to be independent ethnic phenomena; each feature, moreover, may develop from a number of distinct "origins" and may vary in its psychological content. Now, if the individual features are not necessarily totemic, in origin or nature; if, in addition, totemic complexes differ widely in the number and character of their totemic features, then a totemic complex can no longer be regarded as an organic, that is, genetic unit, nor can it be defined by the enumeration of any set of totemic features. Thus the concept is reached that in totemism we deal with a phenomenon of association of various ethnic features, of features essentially heterogeneous in their natures, and independent in their histories. The associations, moreover, which constitute totemic complexes are of a type known in modern ethnology as convergent developments. For the totemic complexes, the final products of totemic processes seem to reveal a far greater degree of resemblance, both objective and psychological, than either the totemic processes or the remote totemic origins.

It will thus be seen that I do not close my eyes to far-reaching similarities in totemic organizations the world over. Mr Lang would have me "explain" these similarities. "It is rather Mr Goldenweiser's task," writes Mr Lang, "to explain the amazing resemblances in the totemisms of peoples so remote from each other as certain tribes of America and Australia, than my business to explain why the totemism of the Arunta differs so widely from that of the Tlingit and Haida" (p. 371). But my primary purpose was not that of explanation. I hope I have made clear that the comparison between one American and

¹ When quoting Dr Lowie's exposition of parts of my *Totemism* Mr Lang adduces further bracketed criticisms of certain statements as to clan exogamy, etc., which are not true of the Aranda (p. 375). In a letter of Feb. 29, 1912, Mr Lang refers to this point. He writes: "Any mistake I made through supposing that Central means of the Centre should be deleted." No further reference need thus be made to the matter.

one Australian totemic complex was made in order to bring out the marked variability in objective and psychological content of totemic complexes as actually found. Evidence from elsewhere served to support this conclusion. Having thus established the position that the specific content of totemic complexes cannot be regarded as their essential characteristic, I then tried to ascertain whether there were not some common feature in all totemic complexes, a feature that could be regarded as definitely symptomatic. I eventually found such a feature in the circumstance that in all totemic organizations we find a differentiation of a group into definite social units—clans—within the limits of each of which the so-called totemic features are socialized. The specific content of the features in each clan is different, but the form they assume is strictly identical in all the social units of the group, which units may thus be described as *equivalent totemic units* the aggregate of which constitutes a totemic organization. In *Totemism and Exogamy Defined: A Rejoinder*¹ I then expressed the belief that this tendency of "totemic" features for specific socialization cannot itself be regarded as a product of convergent evolution but must rather be conceived as a primary socio-psychological fact that may eventually prove to be the means by which the convergent developments of totemic complexes are achieved. Pending much more prolonged and elaborate investigation into the nature of totemic phenomena, all this must needs be very vague and unsatisfactory, but Mr Lang will realize that I am very far from making far-fetched attempts at finding differences where similarities are essential, or from denying the fundamental unity of the totemic problem, notwithstanding the genetic heterogeneity of totemic complexes.²

My attitude toward Mr Lang's positive interpretations of totemism flows naturally from the above theoretical positions. "I think it possible," says Mr Lang in the opening paragraph of his critique, "to discern the main type of totemism, and to account for divergences" (p. 368); and again, when referring to non-exogamous totemic clans: "They are deviations from the prevalent type of clans with totemic

¹ *American Anthropologist*, 1911, vol. 13, pp. 589-597.

² Mr Frazer in his *Totemism and Exogamy* has repeatedly emphasized the position that a differentiation of a group into clans with totemic features—I should say into "equivalent totemic units"—is a condition *sine qua non* of "totemism". In some other sections of his work, again, he has turned his back on that proposition. The first to draw attention to this side of totemism was Léon Marillier in his memorable articles on "La Place du Totémisme dans l'Évolution Religieuse" (*Revue d'Histoire des Religions*, vs. 36 and 37. Cf., e. g., vol. 37, p. 393).

names plus exogamy. They are exceptions to the rule, and, as such, they prove the rule. They are divergences from the type, and, as such they prove the existence of the type from which they have diverged."¹

In other places he speaks of exogamous clans with totemic names as "universal" and "normal"¹ features of totemism and of totemism as characterized by exogamous kins bearing totemic names.¹ I have in *Totemism* touched but indirectly on this subject of the comparative permanence or variability of the different features of totemic complexes. In principle, I here agree with Mr Lang. I should not, with him, regard exogamy and totemic names as "universal" features of totemism,—Mr Lang is, of course, familiar with the "exceptions,"—but I should endorse the statement that clans with totemic names are, in an overwhelming majority of cases, exogamous. The two traits may thus be called "normal" features of totemism, and totemism may be said to be "characterized" by them. In a purely objective and descriptive sense, we might even use the term "type" in this connection. But would these terminological niceties carry us any farther in the understanding of totemic phenomena? Decidedly not. With or without these terms, we do not get beyond the purely descriptive fact that exogamy and totemic names are the most permanent of the features of totemism. For it does not at all follow from the above considerations that totemism is an "integral phenomenon existing in many various forms," nor that "there is 'an organic unity' of the features of totemism, of these two features, the essential features." In order to justify these statements we should be able to demonstrate that it is of the nature of exogamous clans to have animal names, and that it is of the nature of clans with animal names to be, as such, exogamous. This demonstration cannot be made. Exogamous clans may have local names (Haida, Tlingit) or names derived from taboos (Omaha), or nicknames (Crow), or names that are collective forms of the names of ancestors (Kwakiutl), and be none the worse for it. Animal-named clans, on the other hand, whenever their exogamy is derivative, cannot be regarded to have, in their capacity as clans, anything to do with exogamy. From this point of view wide areas where totemic clans are exogamous units, as in Africa and India, would have to be sharply differentiated from other wide areas, such as Australia and part of North America, where totemic clans are associated with the division of a tribe into two exogamous halves. In the latter instances a special investigation would be required in each individual

¹ Personal communication.

case, whether to show that the clans had at a former time been independently exogamous, or that notwithstanding their inclusion in wider exogamous groups, the clans as such also constituted exogamous units. Thus a totemic organization even when reduced to its simplest terms—exogamous clans with totemic names—would still have to be regarded as a complex, constituted by the coexistence of two psychologically and historically independent features. There would be no “integral phenomenon,” no “organic unity.”¹

This brings us to another point, also in part terminological. “How can you know that a clan is totemic,” exclaims Mr Lang, “if it is not called by a totemic name?”² And again: “I start, then, from the totemic names because, no totemic name, no totemic ‘clan’!” Or again, “How can I call a clan ‘totemic’ (however exogamous it may be) if it has neither totem nor totem names?” (p. 372).

I am unaware of having ever maintained that a clan without a totem could be called “totemic”. As to “totemic” names, I believe that the numerous Bantu clans with totems should be called “totemic”, although their totems are non-eponymous. The same applies to the Tlingit.³ On the other hand, would it be wise to apply with Mr Lang the word “totemic” to a clan with naught but a “totemic” name, we should rather say, animal or plant name? To my mind, this use of the term “totemic” would not only be unwise but misleading. If one goes over the list of exogamous *gotras* of a district in India, for instance, he will find that some of these have animal names; others, names derived from a female ancestress; still others, perhaps, archaic names of unknown meaning. Is it justifiable to call the *gotras* with animal names “totemic”, while refusing this designation to the other *gotras*?⁴ Such discrimination would, of course, imply that in case of the animal-named *gotras* we were dealing with a peculiar phenomenon requiring a special term. But this natural inference would be erroneous, for an animal name is in itself in no sense more interesting or significant than a local name, or a nick-

¹ When Mr Lang writes: “For the origin of exogamy I look in another direction, believing that local groups of kin were exogamous long before they were totemic,” he tacitly endorses the principle above enunciated.

² Personal communication.

³ Mr Lang says I “insist” that the Tlingit clans should not be called “totemic”. I have never, to my knowledge, held this opinion. Thus all Mr Lang has to say on this point is directed against a man of straw.

⁴ Mr Lang refers to this point when he says: “My answer is written but would occupy too much space.” I hope Mr Lang will soon find occasion to let us know his attitude on this question.

name, or any other kind of name.¹ It will thus be seen, I trust, that we may not acquiesce in Mr Lang's use of the term "totemic" without making confusion worse confounded.

The question of totemic names reintroduces the much abused social organization of the Tlingit. In this matter, the difficulties, complexities, and puzzles are largely of Mr Lang's own making.² The discussion is needlessly complicated by the introduction of the data as given by Mr Frazer.³ In the tabulated representation of the Tlingit organization, for instance, given by Mr Frazer "on the authority of Mr F. Boas" and reproduced by Mr Lang, Mr Frazer misunderstands Dr Boas. Dr Boas' list is incomplete,⁴ but so far as it goes, corroborates Dr Swanton's conclusion. First he gives the totems [crests] of the Tlingit phratries; then the gentes [clans] of the Stikin tribe are enumerated. Some of the native names are translated as house or local names; it is pointed out that the raven occurs four times as the crest of four gentes [clans] with different native names which therefore cannot mean "raven".

I shall now once more give a very brief outline of the Tlingit organization. The Tlingit are divided into 14 geographical groups. These groups, the Tongas, Sanya, Henya, etc., have nothing to do with the social divisions of the Tlingit but merely comprise "the accidental inhabitants of one locality." The main social division is into phratries: Raven and Wolf (also called Eagle in the northern part of the Tlingit country). A small third division, the Nexa'di, belongs to the Sanya geographical group. No marriage within the phratry is tolerated. The large majority of marriages are concluded between the two phratries, but both may also intermarry with the Nexa'di. Descent is maternal. Each of the two phratries comprises a number of clans.⁵ These clans,

¹ What instances like the above really suggest, is a study of names and naming. Thus animal names together with local names, nicknames, etc., would constitute one group of facts deserving closer scrutiny. The animal names of clans, on the other hand, would also have to be studied in their relation to animal names given to other units, such as tribes, religious societies, individuals, houses, constellations. The "doctrine of naming" is not, as it was once thought to be, coextensive with totemism, but it constitutes a fascinating, albeit neglected, phase of primitive life and thought. Mr Lang is one of the few students to whom we are indebted for having thrown some light on one side of this vast subject.

² Personal communication.

³ *Totemism and Exogamy*, vol. III, p. 266.

⁴ *Reports of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, 1899, p. 821.

⁵ As all members of a clan always belong to one phratry, they cannot intermarry. Thus the clans are not exogamous units. Their exogamy is derivative in the same sense in which the exogamy of the Dieri clans is derivative.

which with some few exceptions have local names, are social divisions. A man is born into the clan of his mother; the clan membership, that is, is quite independent of all considerations of locality. Swanton, who, by the way, holds no "theory of what a Tlingit 'clan' really is", but merely describes what he finds, enumerates 28 clans of the Raven phratry, and 26 clans of the Wolf phratry. Of the Raven clans ("Raven" is not the name of the clans), one occurs in four geographical divisions, one in three, one in two; each of the remaining 25 clans occurs only in one locality. Of the Wolf clans, one occurs in four geographical divisions, two in three, one in two; the remaining 21 clans occur only once. This distribution indicates that the clans are also local groups, which does not mean, of course, that all members of any clan are restricted to one locality; but it does mean that definite localities or groups of houses are associated with individual clans, and that the clansmen are aware of this fact. Here one or two concrete examples may prove useful. Thus the people of the Téqoedī clan (phratry Wolf) occupy four houses in the Tongas geographical division, three in the Sanya, one in the Hutsnuwu, and one in the Yakutat geographical divisions. The Chilkat geographical division, on the other hand, comprises three clans of the Raven phratry: the Łuqā'xadi (one house), Ganaxa'dī (six houses), and Nucēkaā'yī (?); and three clans of the Wolf phratry: the Kā'gwantān (eight houses), Taqēstina' (two houses), and Daqllawe'dī (two houses). Mr Lang's conjecture that the Tlingit clans formerly had animal names is not supported by any evidence whatsoever. It is highly probable, on the other hand, that the local segregation of the members of a clan was in former times much more pronounced than is at present the case. Each clan has a tradition in which the origin of the clan is traced to some locality often different from the one now occupied by the clan. If a clan is distributed in several geographical groups the several sections of the clan all have the same tradition as to their common origin in some definite locality.¹ What these old conditions actually were, we can only

¹ That traditions often reflect the state of society in which they arise, Mr Lang admits, but he has often and vigorously denied that "myth making" had anything to do with historic fact. That the contrary may sometimes be true appears from the following instance: On pp. 114 and 115 of his Haida monograph Swanton gives two tables in which the crests of the Raven and of the Eagle families are represented in statistical form. An inspection of the Raven crests reveals the fact that the Raven families fall into two groups. In the first group, the killer-whale and the grizzly-bear crests appear while the rainbow is absent; in the second group, the killer-whale and rainbow appear while the grizzly-bear is absent. When this result is compared with the genealogy representing the legendary history of the Haida families (op. cit., p. 76), all the families of the second group are found to be the descendants of the Lawn-Hill

conjecture, but what they may have been can be gathered from the instances of the Lillooet or the Bellacoola, who were once organized in village communities which subsequently became clans.

A few words are due to Mr Lang's theory of the origin of totemism. Mr Lang refers to my "very brief" and, I may add, thoroughly inadequate, criticism of that theory. It was not my purpose to give, in *Totemism*, an exhaustive critique of totemic origin theories. I there contented myself with making some general remarks about the methodological weakness of all such theories. Opportunity may soon be given us to deal *in extenso* with Mr Lang's own "vision" of totemism; hence I will not do so in these pages. One more point, however, deserves notice. Mr Lang refers to the passage where I suggest "animal taboos, or a belief in descent from an animal, or primitive hunting regulations, or what not" (p. 369), as possible starting points of totemism, on a par, of course, with Mr Lang's animal names of exogamous local groups. He objects to each one of my suggestions (including even "what not") as possible alternatives to his own theory. Taboos "are imposed for many known and some unknown reasons, and not all totem-kins taboo the totem object," while "the belief in descent from an animal is only one out of many post-totemic myths explanatory of totemism," etc. Hence, these features cannot, in Mr Lang's opinion, be conceived as starting points of totemism. If we endorse Mr Lang's assumption of the monogenetic character of totemism, his objections to my alternatives are valid. But Mr Lang realizes that I do not accept this assumption (p. 368). If so much be granted, taboos, belief in descent from animals or plants, hunting regulations, etc., could be regarded as possible starting points. But if we admit the plausibility of other "origins", the methodological error in proclaiming one origin as the true one, no matter how plausible, becomes at once apparent. In anticipation of misapprehension, I must add that all I mean in speaking of some one feature as the origin of totemism is that the particular feature happened to appear first in the development of a given totemic complex. The totality of the historic process was in all cases much more complex than would appear from any of the current totemic origin theories,

branch of the southern branch of the Middle-Town people. Thus legend and objective classification tell the same story. Some of the Eagle families can also be arranged in two groups. The first group is characterized by the appearance of the eagle, beaver, sculpin, and frog crests. In the second group the halibut and cormorant appear in addition, while the frog is absent. And again the results are found to agree with the traditional history of the Eagle families (op. cit., p. 93): group one descends from Labret-Woman, group two from Property-Making-a-Noise.

including Mr Lang's. This explains why I do not attempt to construct a series of causally linked stages of development from any of the suggested "origins", as, for instance, Mr Lang has attempted when using the acceptance of animal names by local groups as his starting point. It will be admitted that at each point in Mr Lang's totemic evolution where something happens, something else might also happen, from either "inner" or "outer" causes. In other words, the assumption that the one definite thing happened, and no other, is always artificial and devoid of historical value, although the assumption may be rendered plausible by finding instances among existing totemic peoples where this one thing actually happens. The greater the number of such assumed happenings, the more artificial and arbitrary is the hypothesis; and with each new assumed happening the probability that the hypothesis represents an *actual* series of occurrences decreases at a tremendous ratio. Mr Lang quite misunderstands me when he assumes that I object to all reconstruction of developments. I should, on the contrary, insist on the necessity of such reconstructions in limited cultural areas.¹ What I do object to is the generalizing of such reconstructions and their application as interpretative principles to other cultural areas, on the assumption that interpretations that applied in one instance would also apply in all other instances. Without specifically commenting on the reconstructions suggested by Mr Lang (p. 379), I fully endorse the principle involved so long as such reconstructions are used as interpretations of the material from which they are derived. I do not wish to imply that our reconstructions will never lead to any generalizations or that missing links in the cultural development of one area could in no case be supplied from a parallel instance observed elsewhere; but I insist that, in the present state of our knowledge, all such procedures require special justification in each individual instance and should not be based on the assumption of a general similarity of developments, totemic or otherwise.

Such was the intended meaning of the "highly abstract" (but why "incorrect"?) passage from my *Totemism* cited and criticized by Mr Lang. An instance given by Mr Lang well illustrates the above principle. It reads: "The processes by which the clan badge got out of the original into the opposite phratry (among the Tlingit) is not that by which Arunta totems are still getting out of the 'right' into the 'wrong' matrimonial class. But the result is the same." Here we have an instance

¹ Cf. my treatment of the processes of cultural diffusion and assimilation among the tribes of the Pacific Northwest (*Journal of American Folk-Lore*, 1910, pp. 281-287).

of convergent evolution,¹ as well as an illustration of how dangerous it may prove to interpret a phenomenon in one cultural complex by means of the results reached in the study of another.

A. A. GOLDENWEISER

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK CITY

TRACES OF THE STONE AGE AMONG THE EASTERN AND NORTHERN TRIBES

ONE of the most frequent complaints of the archeologist is that the descendants of our native Indian tribes have no knowledge whatever of the arts and manufactures of the stone age. This is a charge which, while to a great extent correct, is nevertheless not quite so sweepingly true as many believe, and the searcher seldom fails to find some recollections of stone-age industries.

It is constantly asserted by certain students that the historic Indians did not make stone arrow-points, but used bone, antler, or some other substance to the complete exclusion of stone. Archeological and documentary evidence aside, there are numerous definite traditions to the contrary among our Eastern tribes. I shall quote a few that have come to my personal notice.

In 1904 there were several Seneca Iroquois still living on the Cattaraugus reservation in western New York who remembered the process, and one, William Blueskye, had himself made and used stone arrow-points as a boy. He still retained the art, and chipped rather clumsy points from flint pebbles by means of a pebble hammerstone alone, not using a bone flaker. He said that it was difficult to get flint that would chip properly, as most of the stone found on the surface was too dry. Freshly quarried flint was better for the purpose. He claimed that the Seneca formerly boiled the flint for several days, along with medicine herbs, to make it flake more easily.

This latter statement is corroborated by old Menomini, who say that the fat of large animals was boiled with the stone. When Hoffman wrote,² he spoke as though the Menomini of his time were still cognizant of the art, but it has now passed into oblivion, except in the instance

¹ I trust Mr Lang is no longer in doubt as to the meaning of the term "convergent evolution". For a somewhat detailed treatment of this topic I should refer him to Dr Lowie's article "On the Principle of Convergence in Ethnology" (*Journal of American Folk-Lore*, Jan.-Mar., 1912).

² Hoffman, *The Menomini*, 14th Ann. Rep. Bur. Amer. Ethnol., p. 256.